BEFORE THE 1 POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD STATE OF WASHINGTON 2 3 IN THE MATTER OF NORTHWEST PIPE & STEEL, INC., 4 PCHB No. 468 Appellant, 5 FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, VS. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW 6 AND ORDER PUGET SOUND AIR POLLUTION 7 CONTROL AGENCY, 8 Respondent. 9

THIS MATTER being an appeal of a \$50.00 civil penalty for an 10 alleged open-burning violation of respondent's Regulation I; having 11 come on regularly for hearing before the Pollution Control Hearings 12 Board on the 25th day of January, 1974, at Lacey, Washington; and 13 i 14 | appellant Northwest Pipe & Steel, Inc. appearing through its presuction Jay Wax and respondent Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Agency 2, 200 459 15 18 unroug its attorney, Keith D. McGoffin; and Board members present at 17 the hearing being W. A. Gissberg (presiding), Mary Ellen McCaffree and 18 Walt Wo.dward; and the Board having considered the sworn testime.

1	exhibits, records and files herein and having entered on the 4th day of
2	February, 1974, its proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and
3	Order, and the Board having served said proposed Findings, Conclusions
4	and Order upon all parties herein by certified mail, return receipt
5	requested and twenty days having elapsed from said service; and
6	The Board having received no exceptions to said proposed Findings,
7	Conclusions and Order; and the Board being fully advised in the
8	premises; now therefore,
9	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that said proposed
10	Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order, dated the 4th day of
11	February, 1974, and incorporated by this reference herein and attached
12	hereto as Exhibit A, are adopted and hereby entered as the Board's
13	Final Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order herein.
14	DONE at Lacey, Washington, this 200 day of More, 1974.
15	POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD
16	Hat no dwards
17	WALT WOODWARD, Chairman
18	i die
19	W. A. GISSBERG, Member /
20	
21	0, 500,
22	MARY ELLEN MCCAFFREE, Member
23	
24	
95	

26 FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW 27 AND ORDER

1	CERTIFICATION OF MAILING
2	I, LaRene C. Barlin, certify that I mailed copies of the foregoing
3	document on the 5th day of March, 1974, to each of the
4	following parties:
5	Mr. Jay Wax, President Northwest Pipe and Steel, Inc.
6	P. O. Box 11247 Tacoma, Washington 98409
7	Mr. Keith D. McGoffin
8	Burkey, Marsico, Rovai & McGoffin 818 South Yakima Avenue
9	Tacoma, Washington 98405
10	Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Agency
11	410 West Harrison Street Seattle, Washington 98119
12	
13	the foregoing being the last known post office addresses of the
14	above-named parties. I further certify that proper postage had
	been affixed to the envelopes deposited in the U.S. mail.
16	
17	LARENE C. BARLIN
18	POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
27	AND ORDER 3

5 F No 9928-A-

BEFORE THE 1 POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD STATE OF WASHINGTON 2 IN THE MATTER OF 3 NORTHWEST PIPE & STEEL, INC. 4 Appellant, PCHB No. 468 5 FINDINGS OF FACT, vs. CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER 6 PUGET SOUND AIR POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY, 7 Respondent. 8 9

This matter, the appeal of a \$50.00 civil penalty for an alleged open-burning violation of respondent's Rgulation I, came before the Pollution Control Hearing Board (W. A. Gissberg, presiding officer, and Mary Ellen McCaffree and Walt Woodward) in a formal hearing in the Board's office at Lacey, Washington, at 11:00 a.m., January 25, 1974.

Appellant was represented by its president, Jay Wax. Respondent appeared through Keith D. McGoffin. Eugene Barker, Olympia court reporter, recorded the proceedings.

Witnesses were sworn and testified. Exhibits were admitted.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

From testimony heard and exhibits examined, the Pollution Control Hearings Board makes these

## FINDINGS OF FACT

I.

A plume of white smoke arose from a smoldering outdoor fire in appellant's scrap metal yard at South M Street and South Tacoma Way, Tacoma, Pierce County, for at least five minutes about 9:50 a.m., on September 26, 1973. The smoke came from burning electrical insultation in a transformer which had caught on fire when appellant's workman used a cutting torch on it.

II.

The workman, not deeming the fire of sufficient import to use nearby fire extinguishers to smother the blaze, poured water and dirt on the fire. Under the impression this was extinguishing the fire, the workman had gone a few feet distant to assist another workman.

III.

An inspector on respondent's staff, noting the plume from two blocks away, served Notice of Violation No. 8228, citing Section 9.02 of respondent's Regulation I. Subsequently, and in connection therewith, respondent served on appellant Notice of Civil Penalty No. 1199 in the amount of \$50.00, the subject of this appeal.

IV.

On April 10, 1973, as the result of a somewhat similar alleged violation, respondent served on appellant Notice of Violation No. 7409, but no civil penalty was invoked.

FINDINGS OF FACT,

<sup>27</sup> CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER

 $\overline{2}$ 

 $20^{\circ}$ 

27 FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER

Section 9.02(b)(4) of respondent's Regulation I makes it unlawful to "allow" an outdoor fire for the purpose of salvage of materials.

Section 3.29 of respondent's Regulation I authorizes a civil penalty of not more than \$250.00 for any violation of Regulation I.

VI.

Appellant's employees are instructed by appellant to extinguish promptly all fires accidentally started in metal cutting operations but appellant deems it "senseless" to employ fire extinguishers "every time, out in the open."

VII.

Any Conclusion of Law hereinafter recited which should be deemed a Finding of Fact is hereby adopted as such.

From these Findings, the Pollution Control Hearings Board comes to these

## CONCLUSIONS

I.

The crux of this matter is the method employed by appellant's workmen in extinguishing cutting-torch fires. There is no question but what they act promptly to extinguish such fires. For some reason—perhaps the cost or perhaps the inconvenience—they are not instructed, nor do they use, commercial, flame—smothering fire extinguishers, but rely, instead, on water and dirt. Here, the Board believes, appellant is exercising a judgment on how quickly the pollution—causing smoke of a fire should be eliminated. However, respondent's Regulation I does not give to appellant that judgment option. The rule, which the Board FINDINGS OF FACT,

must sustain, is not to "allow" outdoor fires, even for a few minutes, 1 in the salvage of materials. 2 II. 3 Having reached this Conclusion, the Board, therefore, must find 4 that appellant was in violation of respondent's Regulation I on 5 September 26, 1973, as cited in Notice of Violation No. 8228. 6 III. 7 Notice of Civil Penalty No. 1199, while reasonable, can be 8 suspended to give appellant an opportunity to profit by this Board's 9 warning on the prompt use of flame-smothering commercial fire 10 extinguishers. 11 IV. 12 Any Finding of Fact which should be deemed a Conclusion of Law is 13 hereby adopted as such. 14 Therefore, the Pollution Control Hearings Board makes this 15 16 ORDER The appeal is denied, but the \$50.00 civil penalty is suspended 17 pending no similar violation for a period of six months from the date 18 this Order becomes final. 19 DONE at Lacey, Washington this 4th day of 7clock help, 20 POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS' BOARD 21 2223  $^{24}$ 25 26 FINDINGS OF FACT.

5 F No 9928-A

CONCLUSIONS AND ORDER